REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested. Claims 5-6, 12, 15, 25, and 55 are cancelled, and claims 70-72 are added. Claims 1-4, 7-11, 13-14, 16-24, 26-54, and 56-69 remain in this application as amended herein. Accordingly, claims 1-4, 7-11, 13-14, 16-24, 26-54, and 56-72 are submitted for the Examiner's reconsideration.

Claims 7, 21, 26, 29, 32-37, 39, 49, and 54 have been amended solely to have the claims better conform to the requirements of U.S. practice. None of these amendments is intended to narrow the scope of any of these claims, and no new matter has been added by these amendments.

In the Office Action, claims 1-4, 7-14, 16, 21-24, 26-27, 36-54, and 67-69 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)as being unpatentable over Cooper (U.S. Patent No. 6,754,904) in view of Zenith (U.S. Patent No. 6,519,771) and further in view of Abecassis (U.S. Patent No. 5,610,650) and Vong (U.S. Patent No. 6,918,317). Claim 12 is cancelled. Applicants submit that the remaining claims are patentably distinguishable over the relied on sections of the references.

Independent claims 1, 24, and 50 have been amended to more clearly show the differences between the claimed features and the relied on art. No new matter has been added by these changes. Support for these changes is found at, e.g., Figs. 5, 7-8, and 25-27 and pages 26-27 and 39-40 of the specification.

As amended herein, claim 1 recites:

a display unit operable to display selected content, to display a user list identifying the plurality of users of said client device, to receive a user-entered password in response to the given one of the plurality of users being selected, and in response to said client device verifying that the user-entered password corresponds to the particular one of the plurality of passwords that is associated with the given one of the plurality of users, to display content based on the received content data and display a plurality of plates, a portion of the plurality of plates being associated with a plurality of members of a buddy list of the given one of the plurality of users such that a given one of the portion of the plurality of plates is associated with a specific one of the plurality of members of the buddy list and includes a region providing an associated one of a plurality of visual clues which indicates an on-line status of another client device associated with that member of the buddy list, said display unit being further operable to display only the region providing the associated one of the plurality of visual clues in place of the given one of the plurality of plates, the plurality of plates including a group plate associated with a group that includes any of the members of the whose associated client buddy list device displaying the selected content and which includes the plates associated with such members of the buddy list, the group plate including a message urging the given one of the plurality of users to invite the members of the buddy list to watch the selected content upon none of the members of the buddy list being included in the group[.]

(Emphasis added.) Neither the relied on sections of Cooper, the relied on sections of Zenith, the relied on sections Abecassis. nor the relied on sections of Vong disclose suggest a group plate associated with a group that includes any members of a buddy list whose associated client device displaying a selected content. Moreover, neither the relied on sections of Cooper, the relied on sections of Zenith, the relied on sections of Abecassis, nor the relied on sections of Vong disclose or suggest a group plate associated with a group that includes any members of a buddy list whose associated client device is displaying a selected content and which includes plates associated with such members of the buddy list. Further, neither the relied on sections of Cooper, the relied on sections of Zenith, the relied on sections of Abecassis, nor the relied on sections of Vong disclose or suggest a group plate including a message urging a given user (of a client device) to invite members of a buddy list to watch a selected content (being displayed by the client device) upon none of the members of the buddy list being included in a group (of any members of the buddy list whose associated client device is displaying the selected content).

The relied on sections of Cooper merely describe displaying (i) members of a buddy list, (ii) the TV show or network currently being watched by each member of the buddy list that is updated upon when a member of the buddy list changes channels, and (iii) the buddy list of a selected member of the buddy list. (See Figs. 11 and 12, and col.7 ll.4-13.) relied on sections of the reference are not at all concerned with a group that includes members of the buddy list who are watching a selected TV show or network, are not at all concerned with displaying which members of the buddy list are watching the selected TV show or network, and are not at all concerned with displaying a message urging a user to invite members of the buddy list to watch the selected TV show or network upon none of the members of the buddy list being included in the group.

Though the relied on sections of Vong describe displaying soft labels that may identify users and that the color of the soft labels can denote members of a group, (see Fig.6, Abstract, and col.8 11.51-55), these sections do not overcome the other deficiencies of the relied on sections of Cooper.

Moreover, neither the relied on sections of Zenith nor relied on sections of the Abecassis overcome the above deficiencies of the relied on sections of Cooper and Vong.

Amended claim 1 also calls for:

a selection unit operable to receive from the given one of the plurality of users a selection of a desired one of the plurality of plates, the display unit being operable to display a plurality of icon buttons in response to the desired one

plurality of plates being selected, the plurality of icon buttons being respectively associated with the plurality of icons such that the invitation icon button is associated with an invitation icon, invitation icon including a message asking particular member of the buddy list to watch the selected content, and the selection unit being further to receive from the given one operable of plurality of users a selection of a desired one of the plurality of icon buttons[.]

(Emphasis added.) Neither the relied on sections of Cooper, the relied on sections of Zenith, the relied on sections Abecassis, nor the relied on sections of Vong disclose or suggest displaying a plurality of icon buttons in response to a desired one of a plurality of plates (associated with plurality of members of a buddy list) being selected. Moreover, neither the relied on sections of Cooper, the relied on sections of Zenith, the relied on sections of Abecassis, nor the relied on sections of Vong disclose or suggest an invitation icon including a message asking a particular member of a buddy list to watch a selected content (being displayed by a client device). Further, neither the relied on sections of Cooper, the relied on sections of Zenith, the relied on sections Abecassis, nor the relied on sections of Vong disclose or suggest an invitation icon button associated with an invitation icon (including a message asking a particular member of a buddy list to watch a selected content being displayed by a client device).

The relied on sections of Zenith simply describe sending a request to join a chat room corresponding to the particular television show being displayed and that actuating a displayed link causes the display of response choices. Figs. 4-7, col. 5 11. 20-25, and col. 6 11. 4-7, 24-26 and 64-67.) These sections are not at all concerned with displaying a plurality of icon buttons in response to selecting a plate associated with one of the members of a buddy list and are not

at all concerned with displaying an invitation icon button associated with an invitation icon including a message asking a particular member of a buddy list to watch a selected content being displayed by a client device.

For at least the reasons set out above, neither the relied on sections of Cooper nor the relied on sections of Vong overcome the above deficiencies of the relied on sections of Zenith.

Moreover, the relied on sections of Abecassis do not overcome the above deficiencies of the relied on sections of Zenith, Cooper and Vong.

Amended claim 1 further calls for:

a transmitter operable to transmit a request to the server in response to the particular one of the plurality of members of the buddy list and the invitation icon button being selected, the request including an identification number of said client device, an identification number of the another client device associated with the particular member of the buddy list, identification data associated with the given one of the plurality of users, the icon identification data set associated with the invitation icon, and data associated with the selected content, the request causing the server to transmit a command to the another client device associated with the particular member of the buddy list, the command including the identification number of said client device, the identification data associated with the given one of the plurality of users, the icon identification data set associated with the invitation icon, and the data associated with the selected content and causing the further client device to execute the invitation icon and display an invitation to watch the selected content[.]

(Emphasis added.)

For at least the reasons set out above, neither the relied on sections of Cooper, the relied on sections of Zenith, the relied on sections of Abecassis, nor the relied on sections of Vong disclose or suggest transmitting a request to a server in response to a particular one of the plurality of members of

the buddy list and an invitation icon button (associated with an invitation icon including a message asking a particular member of a buddy list to watch a selected content being displayed by a client device) being selected. Moreover, neither the relied on sections of Cooper, the relied on sections of Zenith, the relied on sections of Abecassis, nor the relied on sections of Vong disclose or suggest a command including an icon identification data set associated with an invitation icon (including a message asking a particular member of a buddy list to watch a selected content being displayed by a client device). Further, neither the relied on sections of Cooper, the relied on sections of Zenith, the relied on sections of Abecassis, nor the relied on sections of Vong disclose or suggest a command causing a further client device to execute an invitation icon (including a message asking a particular member of a buddy list to watch a selected content being displayed by a client device) and display an invitation to watch the selected content.

It follows, for at least the above reasons, that neither the relied-on sections of Cooper, the relied-on sections of Zenith, the relied-on sections of Abecassis, nor the reliedon sections of Vong, whether taken alone or in combination, disclose or suggest the client device set out in claim 1, and therefore claim 1 is patentably distinct and unobvious over the cited references.

Independent claims 24 and 50 each include features similar to those set out in the above excerpt of claim 1. Therefore, for at least the same reasons, claims 24 and 50 are each patentably distinct and unobvious over relied-on sections of Cooper, Zenith, Abecassis, and Vong.

Claims 2-4, 7-11, 1314, 16, and 21-23 depend from claim 1, claims 26-27 and 36-49 depend from claim 24, claims 51-54, 56 and 67-69 depend from claim 50. Therefore, each of these claims is distinguishable over the cited art for

at least the same reasons as its parent claim.

Claims 17-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cooper in view of Zenith and further in view of Abecassis and Vong (as applied to claim 15) and DeWeese (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0262542), claims 28-35, and 57-66 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)as being unpatentable over Cooper in view of Zenith and further in view of Abecassis and Vong (as applied to claims 25 and 55) and further in view of DeWeese. Applicant submits that the claims are patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Claims 17-20 depend from claim 1, claims 28-35 depend claim 24, and claims 57-66 depend from claim 50. Therefore, each of claims 28-35 and 57-66 is distinguishable over the relied on sections of Cooper, Zenith, Abecassis, and Vong for at least the same reasons as the claim from which it depends.

The relied on sections of DeWeese do not address these deficiencies.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

claim 70 depends from claim 1, depends from claim 24, and new claim 72 depends from claim 50. Therefore, each of these claims is distinguishable over the relied on art for at least the same reasons. Support for new claims 70-72 is found at, e.g., Fig. 27 and page 40 of the specification.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the

Examiner telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which the Examiner might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: February 9, 2009

Respectfully submitted, Electronic signature: /Lawrence E. Russ/ Lawrence E. Russ Registration No.: 35,342 LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG, KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP 600 South Avenue West Westfield, New Jersey 07090 (908) 654-5000 Attorney for Applicant

974157_1.DOC